



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE YEARS 432 AND 431 B.C.¹

BY ALLEN B. WEST

The chronology of the years 432 and 431 is involved in difficulties. As given by Thucydides it is as follows: The battle of Sybota was fought in September, 433.² The Potidaean trouble commenced *ειθες* after this battle.³ It was then that Athens made her peremptory demands. The Potidaeans spent the winter, *ἐκ πολλοῦ πράσσοντες*, in sending embassies and making preparations, and in the following year Archestratos was sent out to enforce the Athenian demands.⁴ He found Potidaea already in revolt⁵ and turned his attention to Macedon. The revolt occurred eight months before the attack on Plataea.⁶ Forty days after the revolt, Aristeus entered Potidaea.⁷ While Aristeus was collecting his forces from the Peloponnes, Callias joined Archestratos⁸ in Macedon, where they remained until the arrival of Aristeus. Then they marched leisurely to Potidaea and the battle followed. Six months later occurred the attack on Plataea, when the archonship of Pythodoros still had two months to run.⁹ The attack was made, *ἄμα ἡρι ἀρχομένω*, at the

¹ The purpose of this paper is to combine the hypothesis of Busolt, that the battle of Potidaea was fought in the tenth month before the attack on Plataea, with the one defended by E. Meyer, which gives the date of the attack on Plataea as March 5 rather than April 4. For the sake of completeness I shall restate many of their arguments, and to avoid cumbering the body of the paper with repeated acknowledgments, I shall content myself with a general acknowledgment of indebtedness in this place. The justification for a paper of this sort, on a subject so much discussed, is not so much in the combination of these two views as in the fact that I shall bring forward some new bits of evidence. For the presentation of Busolt's views and for a bibliography see Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, III, 2, 799, note, and 907, n. 2; also, *Hermes*, 35, 573 ff.

² Thuc. i. 45–51; *IG*, I, 179.

⁴ *Ibid.* 58.

³ Thuc. i. 56–57.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Thuc. ii. 2, *μηνὶ ἔκτῳ*; i. 60–62. Here we have an interval of forty days between the arrival of Aristeus and the revolt and another interval up to the day of the battle. Thus we get a total of about eight months in all between the revolt and the affair at Plataea.

⁷ Thuc. i. 60–62.

⁸ *Ibid.* 61. The reading of the MSS, *ἐπιπαρόντας*, is plainly a mistake for *ἐπιπαρύντας*. See below.

⁹ *Ibid.* ii. 2.

very last of the month, in the dark of the moon. About eighty days later the Peloponnesians invaded Attica, *θέρους καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος*.¹ The invasion lasted more than fifteen days and less than forty.² Shortly before the Peloponnesians left Attica the Athenians sent a fleet of a hundred ships to ravage the Peloponnesian coasts.³ With the aid of inscriptions, we are able to supplement and correct this information which we get from Thucydides.⁴

The discussion centers about two points. Is the reading *μηνὶ ἔκτῳ* correct or should it be emended to *δεκάτῳ*? Secondly, is the *δύο* of Thuc. ii. 2 to be changed to *τέσσαρας* or *πέντε*?

In the course of this paper I shall show that the battle of Potidaea took place in the tenth month before the attack on Plataea and that the archonship of Pythodoros still had five months to run when the attack on Plataea took place. As a result of these two changes the chronology will be as follows: Potidaea revolted shortly before the greater Dionysia, i.e., late in March, 432. Then the Athenian expeditions of Archestratos and Callias and the Corinthian expedition of Aristeus are to be dated in the interval between the revolt and the battle of Potidaea, which was fought in Thargelion, May 15—June 13, the tenth month before the attack on Plataea. The expedition of Phormio was then sent out, not in the year 432–31 as is generally believed, but late in the year 433–32. Plataea was attacked March 5, 431, and the Peloponnesians invaded Attica May 25–27, remaining until about the first of July. Toward the end of the invasion, June 27, in the ninth prytany, probably that of Hippothontis, the Athenian fleet sailed on its voyage about the Peloponnes.

I

In the first place we must consider the inscriptions mentioned above, which not only give us the following definite information, but also present the following questions for settlement. For the year 432–31 the first payment for an expedition to Macedon was made in the second prytany.⁵ This payment was made directly to Eucrates, the general in charge of the expedition, of whom Thucydides tells

¹ *Ibid.* 19.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 23.

² *Ibid.* 57; iv. 6.

⁴ *IG*, I, 179 *ab*.

⁵ The second prytany extended from August 27 to October 4.

us nothing. That other payments, made during the course of the year for the army besieging Potidaea, went through the hands of the Hellenotamiae is evidence that the expedition under Eucrates was the only one sent out to the north during that year. During the course of this paper I shall attempt to show that Thucydides completely failed to mention this expedition of Eucrates. Nine payments were made to the Hellenotamiae for the army at Potidaea, approximately one for each of the eight following prytanies. Payment seven was made in the prytany of Hippothontis, on the sixth or the sixteenth day. Payment eight was made during the same prytany. The ninth payment, which was for the cavalry, was made on the seventeenth day of an unknown prytany. In order to determine when the Athenian fleet sailed on its Peloponnesian expedition in the summer of 431 it is necessary to decide whether Hippothontis held the ninth or the tenth prytany.

We also have fragmentary accounts of the money spent for this fleet, in which the prytany of Hippothontis is again mentioned. In these accounts the first payment was made to the generals Socrates, Proteas, and Carcinos on the eighth day from the end of a prytany. Was this prytany the eighth or the ninth? The other payments for the expedition were made through the Hellenotamiae after the fleet had sailed. The first was made in the prytany of Hippothontis. The second was made in the prytany of -----ntis. Traces of two other payments follow. For a full understanding of the chronology of this year it will be necessary to compare the evidence of these inscriptions with the account given by Thucydides.

First, a glance at the official calendar for the year in question will be necessary.¹ The year of the archonship of Pythodoros ended July 31. The official year of the Boulé ended August 12. The eighth prytany extended from April 18 to May 26; the ninth from May 27 to July 4; and the tenth from July 5 to August 12.

I shall now attempt to show that Hippothontis held the ninth prytany. Let us assume for the moment that this was the case. We have seen that two payments for the army at Potidaea were made

¹ See Keil, *Hermes*, 29, 321 ff. I wish to make a correction in the table opposite p. 358 for the year 431. Hek. 1 is given as August 1. The date for Hek. 13, however, is given as August 14. This is obviously a mistake for August 13.

in that prytany, the first on the sixth or the sixteenth day. The following payment to the cavalry was made on the seventeenth day of an unknown prytany, and it is hardly likely that three payments were made in the short space of twelve days. In that case we must assign the last payment to the tenth prytany. For the Peloponnesian expedition the first payment to the Hellenotamiae was made in the prytany of Hippothontis. Three payments followed this. It is of course possible that four payments were made in one prytany, but not probable. Thus, taking into consideration the two sets of accounts, it would seem that Hippothontis did not hold the last prytany. The question remains: Was the payment to the generals of the fleet made in the prytany of Hippothontis or in the one that preceded? If it was made on the eighth day from the end of the ninth prytany, we must date it June 27. If, however, it came in the eighth, the date is May 19, but that is altogether too early, for we shall see that the earliest possible time for the beginning of the Peloponnesian invasion is May 25. We have no alternative. The payment to the generals was made June 27 in the ninth prytany, which, as we have shown, was probably Hippothontis. Another payment was made in this prytany to the Hellenotamiae. This happened after the fleet had put to sea, for otherwise the payment would have been made to the generals in command of the expedition.¹

II

I shall now discuss the date of the attack on Plataea, showing that it took place March 5, and also that the Peloponnesians invaded Attica May 25-27, about eighty days later. Thucydides says that the archonship of Pythodoros had two months to run at the time of the attack on Plataea, but this is a mistake. We must emend either to a five or a four. Although it is a simple matter to explain the $\delta\sigma$ as a mistake for δ' , the matter is not so simple as it seems. If we assume for the moment that δ' is the correct reading, the

¹ Thuc. ii. 23. The account given by Thucydides is in agreement with that given above. He tells us only this, that the fleet sailed while the Peloponnesians were still in Attica, and that lack of provisions forced them to leave soon afterward. We may infer, however, that by far the greater part of the invasion preceded the departure of the fleet. The end of the invasion probably fell early in July. I shall discuss this point more in detail later.

attack on Plataea took place April 4. Eighty days afterward the Peloponnesians entered Attica, *θέρους καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος*. The number eighty is merely an approximation and gives us a limit of two or three days either way. Reckoning thus, the invasion commenced some time between June 20 and June 25. It lasted more than fifteen days and less than forty. Thus the Peloponnesians left Attica, at the earliest, sixteen days after their arrival, or July 5, at the latest, thirty-nine days afterward or between July 29 and August 3. It is evident from our inscription that the fleet sailed about June 27, and we know that this was shortly before the departure of the invading army. Thus the Peloponnesians probably left Attica about the first of July.

On the face of it, everything seems to fit in with our hypothesis that the attack on Plataea took place April 4, but we have been figuring more closely than the account of Thucydides warrants. The first invasion was not exceptionally short nor has any historian, so far as I know, made that assumption. We gather from Thucydides that it was at least of average duration, for he gives no sign that the Peloponnesians were in Attica only little more than two weeks. On the contrary, his account of the Peloponnesian stay, of the skirmishes, and of the discontent in Athens would lead one to assume that the invasion lasted longer than sixteen days. Busolt has suggested twenty-five days as its probable duration.¹

A further point is to be mentioned. Thucydides tells of nothing that happened after the departure of the fleet. The Peloponnesians remained only until their provisions were exhausted and then retired by a new route. Thus it would seem that this period must have been by far the shortest part of their stay, certainly not more than a third of the total, and it is impossible to assume that the departure of the fleet divided the invasion into two parts, approximately equal, as would be the case if we assume that the Peloponnesians were in Attica only from June 20 to July 5, and that the Athenian expedition sailed about June 27.

Now if we assume a stay longer than sixteen days, we are in greater straits than before. Let us accept Busolt's hypothesis that the invasion lasted twenty-five days. Then the Peloponnesians

¹ *Hermes*, 35, 573 ff.

must have departed from Attica about July 15. Busolt also reckons the period between the sailing of the fleet and the end of the invasion at about eight days. That is approximately one-third of twenty-five. I should agree with him on this point, but when he attempts to reconcile a payment made June 27 with the sailing of the fleet July 7, I cannot see the cogency of his arguments. According to Busolt the first payment cannot have been for the purpose of defraying the expenses incidental to the preparation, as has been suggested, for then there would be no payment to the generals immediately before their departure. Such a payment was usual and necessary. He goes on to say that the Athenians, whenever possible, preferred to pay out small sums at frequent intervals rather than to draw large sums from the sacred treasuries for the purpose of paying the expenses of an expedition far in advance. This was done in order to save interest on the money borrowed from the treasuries of the gods. Busolt's arguments are valid, but they cannot be used to prove his hypothesis. In fact, if rightly used they will disprove it.

If the Athenians were as careful as Busolt suggests—and we have reason to believe that they were—they would not have paid out, as early as June 27, money which was not to be used until after the departure of the fleet ten days later. For proof of this we have the accounts for the rest of the year. The fact that of the four payments made during the remainder of the year three were made in the last prytany shows that in this case the interval between payments was thirteen days at most. It is scarcely probable, therefore, that the Athenians would have allowed this payment to the generals to be made ten days before the fleet sailed. Busolt also states that the payment to the generals was made shortly before their departure during the embarkation. Now the expression “*kurz vor der Abfahrt*” seems to be definite enough and to refer to an interval of at most two or three days, not one of nine.

On the whole, Busolt's hypothesis has no great degree of probability in its favor. In fairness to his argument, however, I must state that he bases his conclusions only in part upon the evidence given above. Perhaps his chief arguments come from the two phrases used by Thucydides, *ἄμα ἦρι ἀρχομένω* and *θέρους καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος*. In the first place, although he thinks that the

summer of Thucydides is not an artificial summer but one dependent upon natural phenomena for its limits, he says that a spring beginning early in March and a harvest in full swing in the latter part of May are impossible. It is evident, however, that an early spring will naturally be followed by an early harvest. It follows that if we can prove the Peloponnesian invasion to have taken place late in May, we have evidence that Athens enjoyed an early spring in 431 and likewise an early harvest. E. Meyer has shown that a harvest in May is not impossible,¹ and Busolt himself admits that in ancient times under favorable conditions the harvest began in May. The question remains as to the precise meaning of *θέρους καὶ τοῦ σίτου ἀκμάζοντος*. Busolt thinks that it refers to a time when the acme of summer and harvest coincided. The acme of summer comes when the sun is at its highest point. The expression *ἀκμάζοντος* is not the same as *μεσοῦντος*. Is Busolt's translation of this phrase the only one possible? A farmer would probably translate as follows: "during the summer and when the grain was ripe." Now the beginning of actual summer according to ancient ideas coincided with the apparent rising of the Pleiades, which is about May 8-9.² The grain, moreover, is ripe about the beginning of harvest and not during the middle of it.

Granting then, as Busolt does, that under favorable conditions the Attic harvest occasionally began in May, let us consider the question from this new angle. As I said before, an early harvest implies an early spring. Therefore, we may put the attack upon Plataea one month earlier, or March 5-6. Eighty days later, about May 25, the Peloponnesians invaded Attica. The number eighty is only approximate and allows us leeway of two or three days. Putting the date as late as possible and assuming an invasion of thirty-five days' duration, we obtain July 1 as the date for the end of the invasion. This is five days after the payment made to the generals of the fleet. The Peloponnesians now have time to exhaust their provisions and to get out of Attica without undue haste and well within the limit. These dates, March 5-6 for the attack on

¹ *Forschungen*, II, 306, n. 2.

² Cf. Schmidt, *Griech. Chron.*, 511. I am not speaking of the Thucydidean *θέρος*, which is equivalent to what we might call the summer semester; nor do I think that Busolt had anything but the natural summer in mind.

Plataea and May 25–27 for the invasion of Attica, are therefore possible, and they fit in well with the facts given by Thucydides and the inscription. The dates given by Busolt are all but impossible, as has been shown, and for the remainder of the discussion I shall reject them in favor of the earlier ones, which seem to have the weight of probability on their side.

III

The foregoing discussion has cleared the way so that we can now settle the chronology of the previous summer. Thucydides says that the attack on Plataea took place in the sixth month after the battle at Potidaea. I shall show that this date is impossible. The account of Thucydides is as follows. After the battle of Potidaea, which took place approximately two months after the revolt,¹ the Athenians invested Potidaea from the north. A little later Phormio was sent out with sixteen hundred hoplites to complete the investment.² For building the wall, sending word to Athens, making a levy, fitting out an expedition, and for the actual voyage a period of at least three weeks should be allowed. The battle of Potidaea, if we accept Thucydides as he stands, took place in the sixth month before the attack on Plataea, which fell on the last day of Gamelion. Boedromion, September 10 to October 9, 432, was then the sixth month, and according to this chronology Phormio arrived no earlier than October 1. It is hardly likely, however, that an Athenian expedition would have been sent out at this time of year, for the Athenians were averse to winter campaigns³ and did everything to avoid them. Phormio completed the investment of Potidaea and then ravaged Bottice and the Chalcidic territory, capturing several places. This brings us at least to the month of November.

Immediately upon the completion of the investment of Potidaea by Phormio, which must have taken several days at any rate, measures were taken by the Corinthians and others to persuade the Lacedaemonians to make war on Athens, and a meeting was called in Sparta to discuss matters.⁴ As Phormio arrived at Potidaea probably no earlier than October 1, and as it must have taken him

¹ See p. 34, above.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 70.

² Thuc. i. 64.

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 67.

some time to make the investment complete, about twenty days must have elapsed between his arrival and the meeting at Sparta. This meeting, then, must have been held about October 21. That the congress was held before October 20 is shown by the fact that Sthene-laidas was still ephor. Ainesias followed him in office on that date.¹ Thus by assigning the battle to the earliest possible date we can perhaps place the meeting of the Peloponnesians during the ephorship of Sthenelaidas.² We have allowed nearly three weeks for the Potidaean investment to be completed, for the Corinthians to get news of this, and for a meeting of the allies to be called, but this is rather close figuring, when we consider that first of all complaints were made to Sparta and that only then did the Lacedaemonians summon the allies to state their grievances.

It was at this meeting that the Corinthians made the following plea: "Now aid the Potidaeans, as you promised, and make an immediate invasion of Attica."³ Such an appeal would scarcely have been made late in October, for it was against all precedent to make important invasions so late in the year. That the Corinthians speak as though it was really possible to carry out this proposal may be taken as an indication that the meeting was held much earlier in the year.

After this congress the allies returned to their homes and a regular synod was called.⁴ Sufficient time intervened for the Corinthians to send embassies to the various cities,⁵ for Sparta to consult the oracle at Delphi,⁶ and for the congress to convene. All of this took time. If the first meeting was held about October 20, the second

¹ Thuc. i. 87; ii. 2; cf. Busolt, *loc. cit.*

² If we should use Busolt's exclusive system of reckoning, it would be a simple matter to date the council at Sparta before October 20 (see below and note to comparative table), and likewise, if we should assume that the Corinthians did not wait for the investment to be completed by Phormio. Whether such a supposition is warranted from the account given by Thucydides is open to question. In i. 64-65 he tells us of the expedition of Phormio, of his investment of Potidaea, and of his further operations. In chap. 67, he continues, *πολιορκουμένης δὲ τῆς Ποτειδαίας (οἱ Κορίνθιοι) οὐκ ἡσύχαζον*. It would almost seem as though the council which was then called was contemporary with the further operations of Phormio just mentioned. This point, however, is of no great importance, as we shall see later.

³ Thuc. i. 71: *Ποτειδεάταις ὥσπερ ὑπεδέξασθε, βοηθήσατε κατὰ τάχος ἐσβαλόντες ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν.*

⁴ *Ibid.* i. 87.

⁵ *Ibid.* 119.

⁶ *Ibid.* 118.

probably met late in November or early in December. The allies decided upon war and made all possible speed in preparing for an invasion of Attica.¹ Why did they not begin the war immediately, as the Corinthians urged them to do? *Μὴ μέλλετε Ποτειδεάταις τε ποιεῖσθαι τιμωρίαν οὖσιν Δωριεῦστι.*² It is evident that the Corinthians had an immediate campaign in mind, for they were afraid that Potidaea would fall and their citizens, shut up within the town, would be captured before anything could be accomplished. If the congress met late in November an invasion of Attica or any sort of campaign would have been out of the question. That is not the reason, however, that Thucydides gives for the delay. He merely states that the allies were unprepared, giving no hint that the synod was held in early winter. Notwithstanding the haste of the Peloponnesian preparations Thucydides tells us that nearly a year passed before the invasion of Attica occurred.³ We have seen that the invasion began about May 25. Now instead of having an interval of nearly a year,⁴ we have less than six months between the second meeting at Sparta and the beginning of the invasion. On the face of it this does not seem to be satisfactory, and, moreover, it leaves only a short time, about three months, for the repeated embassies which were passing back and forth between Athens and Sparta while the preparations were being made.⁵

On the whole an interval of six months between the battle of Potidaea and the attack on Plataea is hardly sufficient. Let us consider the date of the battle of Potidaea from the standpoint of the inscription which gives a record of the moneys spent for the expeditions of the year 432-31 against Macedon and Potidaea. From it we learn that a payment was made to Eucrates in the second prytany. All of the other payments were made through the Hellenotamiae, which indicates that the expeditions for which they were intended

¹ Thuc. i. 125: *δεδογμένον δὲ αὐτοῖς εὐθὺς μὲν ἀδύνατα ἦν ἐπιχειρεῖν ἀπαρασκεύοις οὖσιν.*

² *Ibid.* 124.

³ *Ibid.* 125. This passage is evidently faulty, but no other meaning can be obtained from it.

⁴ *Ibid.*: *ἐνιαυτὸς μὲν οὐ διετρίβη, ἔλασσον δέ, scil.*, between the second meeting at Sparta and the beginning of the invasion.

⁵ *Ibid.* 126 ff., 145.

were in the field when the payments were made. That there was no payment before the one made to Eucrates shows that only one expedition left Athens for the north during that year.

Thucydides, however, gives us an account of three, the first under Archestratos,¹ the second under Callias,² and the third under Phormio.³ I shall show that none of these expeditions coincides with that of Eucrates. As we have seen, the battle of Potidaea, if it took place in the sixth month before the attack on Plataea, must have been fought about September 10. The second prytany commenced August 27 and lasted until October 4. Thus, so far as the date is concerned, the expeditions of Phormio and of Eucrates might have been identical. Phormio, however, sailed directly to Aphytis and did not go to Macedon at all. Later his attentions were confined to Bottice and Chalcidice. Therefore this is not the expedition recorded in the inscription. On the other hand, the expedition of Eucrates may have sailed at the same time with that of Phormio, but Thucydides fails to mention it.

It has been suggested also that the expeditions of Callias and of Eucrates are identical. Callias with his four colleagues joined Archestratos in Macedon before the battle of Potidaea. Eucrates may have been one of these colleagues, but a more careful consideration of the facts makes this explanation impossible. Callias arrived in Macedon before Aristeus entered Potidaea,⁴ and immediately joined Archestratos in the siege of Pydna. Before long the Athenians were constrained to come to an understanding with Perdiccas and to make an alliance with him, for Potidaea, now that Aristeus had come, urgently demanded their presence. Here geographical difficulties in Thucydides beset us, but it is clear, at least, that several days elapsed before the Athenians encamped at Gigonos. We must allow time for the news of the arrival of Aristeus to reach Pydna, for negotiations with Perdiccas, for an unsuccessful attack on Beroea (?), and for a leisurely march of three days. Perhaps ten days is sufficient, to which we can add another ten for the voyage from Athens and for the short stay at Pydna.

We certainly cannot allow less than twenty days for the period between the departure of Callias from the Peiraeus and the battle

¹ Thuc. i. 57.

² *Ibid.* 61.

³ *Ibid.* 64.

⁴ *Ibid.* 61.

which occurred about September 10. That brings us back into the first prytany before Eucrates sailed, which makes the identification of these two expeditions impossible. Only if we put the battle as late as September 15 will the twentieth day fall on the first day of the second prytany, August 27, but we have already seen that the battle must be dated September 10 if the first meeting at Sparta is to take place before October 20.

We have seen that neither the expedition of Callias nor that of Phormio can coincide with that of Eucrates. We have still to show that the expedition of Archestratos also does not fit in with the hypothesis that the battle of Potidaea was fought in September. The fact that Archestratos sailed from Athens with the express purpose of preventing the revolt¹ shows that his departure and the revolt must have occurred about the same time. As we have seen, Potidaea revolted about fifty days before the battle which took place outside the walls of that city. Thus if the battle was fought between September 10 and September 15, the date of the revolt is fixed between July 22 and July 27, and as the year 432-31 commenced on Hek. 7, July 19, we are forced to date both the revolt and the expedition of Archestratos in the first prytany. This is impossible, for our inscription shows that only one expedition left Athens in the year 432-31, and that expedition in the second prytany. Moreover our reckoning has forced us to assign three expeditions, those of Archestratos, Callias, and Phormio to the first two prytanies. Even if we should make alterations sufficient to throw back the expedition of Archestratos into the preceding year, Callias would then have to be assigned to the first prytany and Phormio would still be unaccounted for.²

¹ *Ibid.* 57-59.

² If we assume, as Busolt would do, that Metageitnion, August 12 to September 9, is the sixth month before the attack on Plataea some of our difficulties are removed. The chronology would then be as follows:

Revolt	ca. June 20
Sailing of Callias	ca. July 18
Arrival of Aristeus	ca. August 1
Battle of Potidaea	ca. August 12
Expedition of Phormio	ca. September 1
Council at Sparta	ca. October 1
Synod	ca. November 1

It may be possible in this way to place both the expedition of Callias and Archestratos in the preceding year and to make the expedition of Phormio coincide in point of time

Quite aside from the question whether any expedition previous to that of Eucrates is recorded in our inscription, I wish to suggest that none was practicable at the time when the expeditions of Archestratos and Callias must have sailed. The Etesian winds frequently prevented the Athenians from sending relief expeditions northward in the time of Demosthenes,¹ and Herodotus tells us that the Corcyreans, excusing themselves for their failure to assist the Greeks against the Persians, said that the Etesian winds had not allowed them to double Cape Malea.² It is evident that these winds were an important factor in ancient warfare. They began to blow during the latter part of July, about the time of the apparent rising of Sirius, and continued for forty days.³ Thus it was practically impossible for an Athenian fleet to sail to the Chalcidian peninsula from about July 26 to September 1.

IV

It is evident that the battle of Potidaea cannot have occurred between September 10 and September 15 in the sixth month before the attack on Plataea. When was it fought? The suggestion has been made that δεκάτω be substituted for ἔκτῳ in Thuc. ii. 2. This emendation removes all difficulties. The tenth month before the attack on Plataea was Thargelion, and it extended from May 15 to June 13.⁴ If we date the battle soon after May 15, the revolt

with that of Eucrates, but as one was sent against Macedon and the other to Potidaea I cannot believe that they are identical. It is now quite possible for the council to be held in Sparta before October 20, but we are still left with an interval of only about seven months between the declaration of war and the invasion, and moreover, even with the battle dated a month earlier in this way, it is improbable that Corinth would have urged an invasion at this time of year. On the whole, however, even though we do not count the *terminus a quo*, we are in difficulty if we try to date the battle of Potidaea in the sixth month before Plataea.

¹ Dem. iv. 31; viii. 4.

² Hdt. vii. 168.

³ Schmidt, *Griech. Chron.*, 506.

⁴ According to Busolt's system of reckoning the tenth month before the end of Gamelion, i.e., March 5, was Munychion, April 16 to May 14. This need not trouble us, for we can still date the revolt in late March, by assuming the battle to have taken place shortly before the end of Gamelion. Although Busolt sets the attack on Plataea a month later, his method of counting permits him to date the battle of Potidaea in Thargelion, as I have done. The only difference is that he puts it late in the month, i.e., in the first half of June, while I would date it about the middle of May, early in the month. See below.

of Potidaea and the expedition of Archestratos occurred in the latter half of March, probably about March 25. Thucydides' account of these operations becomes clearer if we understand that they took place in the early spring. In the first place we know that the winter was spent in the negotiations which led to the revolt. During this same time Perdiccas sought the alliance of Corinth, for, as Thucydides says, he had an eye to the revolt of Potidaea. He likewise proposed to the Chalcidians and the Bottiaeans that they should revolt and ally themselves with him. The Athenians, becoming aware of his designs, resolved to forestall the revolt. They had already planned to send an army under Archestratos against Perdiccas, but now they decided to use it to prevent a revolt in the Chalcidian peninsula, and they probably hastened its departure. Everything points to an expedition in early spring. During the winter Perdiccas had become openly hostile to Athens and the Athenians had decided to wage war against him. This of course they would do as soon as the weather permitted, and thus it is reasonable to suppose that they planned the expedition for late March or early April. Affairs in Potidaea, however, caused them to enlarge the commission of Archestratos and perhaps to send him sooner than had been planned. On the whole, it is more probable that this Macedonian campaign had been decided upon during the winter and had been planned for early summer than that Athens deferred it until late in the month of July. March is much more fitting for the beginning of extensive field operations than July.

Secondly, that the Potidaeans should have waited until July, especially as they had the promise of the Spartan ephors to invade Attica when they revolted,¹ does not seem at all in accord with common sense, for an invasion is most effective before the harvest has taken place. Likewise Potidaea would not wish to wait long after the opening of spring for fear that Athens would send an expedition to stop them. That the revolt occurred early in the year becomes more apparent when we consider that the Chalcidians of the smaller maritime villages moved *en masse* to Olynthos.² Spring is the only time for such a general movement of population.

¹ Thuc. i. 58, 71.

² *Ibid.* 57 f.

Thus every indication points to an expedition in spring or early summer, probably about the time of the vernal equinox, when navigation was open and naval operations possible. An earlier departure is scarcely conceivable. I wish to show now that the revolt occurred just before the Greater Dionysia, which was held Elaph. 11-13. That would be the dramatic as well as the economic time to sever relations with Athens, for the allies were required to bring their tribute to the city for this festival. The fact that Athens was usually full of strangers at that time shows that navigation was already open, and the popularity of the Dionysia makes it probable that the proposed Macedonian expedition was to delay its departure until after the festivities had taken place. Affairs in Potidaea, however, forced the Athenians to change their plans and to hasten the sailing of the expedition. Thus it is not at all unlikely that Archestratos was sent out not only to prevent the revolt but also to insure the regular payment of tribute. Furthermore, it is hardly conceivable that the thrifty Greeks in Potidaea should have meekly paid their tribute in the ordinary course of events only to revolt a little later, for they knew from the beginning that Athens did not intend to grant them any of their requests, and they must have felt that revolt was inevitable. Economy would demand that the revolt precede the payment of tribute at the Dionysia. Now in the year 432, Elaph. 11-13 coincides with March 27-29, which fact agrees nicely with our previous hypothesis that Potidaea revolted about March 25. Everything, then, seems to point to March 27-29 as the latest possible date for revolt.

V

Now that we have arrived at a date in March for the sailing of Archestratos, we have next to consider this date in its relation to the subsequent events recorded in Thucydides and in our inscription. About a month after the revolt Callias was sent out with reinforcements and about May 4-8, forty days after the revolt, Aristeus arrived in Potidaea. Ten days later or thereabouts the battle was fought.

In this connection I shall bring forward another argument in favor of the March date for the affair at Plataea. Assuming again

that the attack took place in April, the battle of Potidaea must have been fought in Scirophorion, or between June 14 and July 12.¹ Then the revolt occurred approximately fifty days before, or between April 25 and May 23. This does not fit in with an early spring campaign or with a revolt coincident with the Dionysiac festival. Therefore it must be rejected, for I feel that I cannot emphasize too much the fact that Thucydides, in describing the expedition of Archestratos, gives the impression that it sailed from Athens early in the spring. Thus since the March date for the attack on Plataea fits in best with a revolt at the end of March in the preceding year, we may take this as further evidence that the attack on Plataea was made March 5.

In this place we must stop to consider whether the reading *ἐπιπαρόντας* is to be accepted for the MSS-reading *ἐπιπαρόντας*.² Chronologically either reading is quite possible, but objections have been raised to the MSS-reading on the ground that the word *ἐπιπάρειμι* is not found elsewhere in writers of the classical period.

Another objection, however, has been raised to the reading *ἐπιπαρόντας*. Later in the same chapter³ Thucydides tells of the arrival of Callias in Macedon and of his participation in the siege of Pydna. Instead of going directly to Potidaea he remained at Pydna for a time. Thucydides continues: "But before long the Athenians came to an understanding and made an alliance with Perdiccas. They were forced to do this because Aristeus had arrived."⁴ It seems to be clear from this that the arrival of Callias at Pydna preceded that of Aristeus at Potidaea, and therefore I accept the emendation *ἐπιπαρόντας*.⁵

¹ Here again, if we accept Busolt's method of counting, Thargelion becomes the tenth month and the following discussion does not hold good.

² Thuc. i. 61.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* : ὡς αὐτὸς κατήπειγεν ἡ Ποτεῖδαια καὶ ὁ Ἀριστεὺς παρεληλυθός.

⁵ I may say here that if the reading of the MSS should be retained, some of the objections to the reading *ἐκτρφ* would be removed, but even this is not sufficient to invalidate our previous argument against that reading. If *ἐπιπαρόντας* is the correct reading and if the battle was fought September 15, Callias might have sailed on the first day of the second prytany, and his expedition might then be identical with that of Eucrates. Fifty or sixty days before his departure Archestratos sailed. Thus Archestratos left Athens shortly before the new year. Meyer accepts the MSS-reading evidently with these things in mind (*G.d.A.*, IV, 287). This reckoning, however, does not avoid the difficulty that only one expedition was sent out to the

We can now take up the question of the expedition of Phormio in connection with our hypothesis that an interval of ten months elapsed between the battle of Potidaea and the attack on Plataea. After the battle the Athenian forces began the investment of Potidaea from the north only. When Athens heard that on the side toward Pallene the city was not invested, an expedition under Phormio was sent out.¹ A month's time is amply sufficient for all preparations. Even if we should date the battle early in June, Phormio² sailed before the beginning of the new year, and Eucrates some two or three months afterward. Things are now quite clear and we are free from all chronological difficulties, for the three expeditions mentioned by Thucydides no longer fall in the year 432-31.

To continue, Phormio completed the investment of Potidaea and ravaged the Chalcidian and Bottiaean territories. About the month of September Eucrates was sent out against Perdiccas. This expedition is not mentioned by Thucydides, but the reason for the expedition is quite obvious. Perdiccas had deserted the Athenian cause just before the battle at Potidaea and was probably giving assistance to the Chalcidians, or perhaps merely threatening to do so. In any case the Athenians still had their interrupted spring campaign to finish and Therme, an excellent base of operations, was still in their possession. Athens probably had two objects in view: to punish Perdiccas and to prevent him from giving assistance to the besieged Potidaea. Thus this campaign was parallel with that of Phormio, and Eucrates was to keep Perdiccas busy while Phormio conquered the Chalcidians. In this way Athens tried to divide the forces of the enemy.

Now that we have dated the revolt early in the spring of 432, we have plenty of time for Corinth to call together the dissatisfied Peloponnesian allies at Sparta before October 20. This they did immediately after Phormio completed the investment of Potidaea

north in the year 432-31, and as a consequence we have no place for Phormio in the inscription, *IG*, I, 179a. The other difficulties discussed above are not affected by a change of reading.

¹ Thuc. i. 64.

² I can see no reason for assuming that the expedition of Phormio did not sail until September, as Busolt does. In fact, everything points to the conclusion that his expedition was sent out during the year 433-32.

and soon after the passage of the Megarian decree, early in the year 432-31.¹ August is not too early for this meeting, and the Corinthians could then demand an immediate invasion of Attica with some hopes of success. A month later the Peloponnesian synod met, and again the Corinthians insisted upon the necessity of doing something for the relief of Potidaea before it was too late. An invasion of Attica might even then have been made and perhaps have been effective. Nothing was done, however, and nearly a year passed before the Peloponnesians crossed the Attic borders. The period of nearly nine months between September 1 and May 25 is much more in accord with the expression used by Thucydides than the six months between November and May. We have now about three months more time for the repeated embassies that passed between Athens and Sparta. Taking everything into consideration, we can be almost certain that the *ἐκτώ* of the MSS is a mistake for *δεκάτω*. The one reading presents many difficulties; the other makes all go smoothly.

VI

Let us consider again the date of the attack on Plataea in the light of the preceding discussion. In the first place, I may say for the benefit of those who are still inclined to defend the April date, that such a hypothesis makes the reading *ἐκτώ* more impossible than before unless they accept Busolt's reckoning² by which Boedromion becomes the sixth month. It will be well to consider the question briefly. The battle of Potidaea must have been fought in Pyanepsion, which extended from October 10 to November 7. It is now quite impossible for Phormio to complete the investment of Potidaea and for the first meeting to be held before October 20. The revolt of Potidaea, even if we accept the rejected *ἐπιταρόντας*, must have taken place after the first of August, and that puts three expeditions in the year 432-31, one of them certainly in the first prytany, and another in the third. All of this is quite impossible.

VII

Turning aside from chronology, I shall conclude the discussion with a few words upon the Athenian strategoi of the years 433-32

¹ Thuc. i. 66 f.

² See above.

	Thucydides	Busolt*	Meyer	Revised
Revolt of Potidaea and sailing of Archedratos	After battle of Sybota, (<i>Ποτεδάται</i>) ἐκ πολλοῦ πράσσοντες, up to revolt. i. 58	End of March or early April	June	ca. March 25
Arrival of Callias in Macedonia	Before arrival of Aristeus. i. 61	Late April	End of August	ca. April 25
Arrival of Aristeus in Potidaea	Forty days after revolt. i. 60	Early May	Beginning of August	May 4-8
Battle of Potidaea	In the sixth month before attack on Plataea. ii. 2	Early June; tenth month, May 15—June 13	Sixth month; end of September	Tenth month, ca. May 15
Expedition of Phormio	After Potidaea was invested on the north. i. 64	ca. September	ca. October	ca. June 15
Expedition of Eucrates	September	End of August	Early September
Council at Sparta	After investment of Potidaea. i. 67. In ephorship of Sthene-laidas. i. 87	Second half of July	Ephorship of Sthene-laidas, after Megarian decree	August
Synod at Sparta	Nearly a year before invasion. i. 125	August—September	Late autumn	September
Attack on Plataea	Two months before year 431-30. ii. 2	April 4	March 5	March 5
Peloponnesian invasion	Eighty days after attack on Plataea. ii. 19	ca. June 20	ca. May 25	ca. May 27
Sailing of Athenian fleet	Toward the end of the invasion. ii. 23	June 27	June 27	June 27
Departure of Peloponnesians from Attica	After departure of fleet. ii. 23	ca. July 15	ca. July 1

* Busolt's reckoning is based upon the supposition that Thucydides commences to count with Gamelion instead of Anthesterion (*Griech. Gesch.*, III, 2, 800, note; cf. III, 1, 199). In that way he is able to assume that Boedromion was the sixth and Thargelion the tenth month before the attack on Plataea, for which his date is the last of Anthesterion. It is difficult to agree with him on this point. Granted that the attack on Plataea took place the night of Anth. 29-30, the sixth month preceding actually extended from Boed. 29 to Pyan. 27. Thus, to consider Boedromion the sixth month, which is to all practical intents and purposes the seventh except for a day, seems illogical. This method of reckoning would make the expression "in the sixth month before" nearly equal to "six months before," which is quite a different matter. It can be shown, moreover, that Busolt has misinterpreted the passages in Thucydides, on which he relies to prove the correctness of his exclusive method of reckoning years, and thus he is without proof for his peculiar method of reckoning months. As I have dated the attack on Plataea in Gamelion instead of Anthesterion, it is necessary for me to consider Boedromion the sixth and Thargelion the tenth month before Plataea, as Busolt does, for in this paper I have not made use of Busolt's system of reckoning. In the notes, however, I have shown that our conclusions will not be materially altered if we grant the possibility that Thucydides counts years by one method and months by another.

and 432-31. It will be necessary to make certain corrections in the lists given by Beloch.¹ His list for the year 433-32 is as follows: Erechtheis, Diotimos; Acamantis, Glaucon and Pericles; Oeneis, Lacedaimonios; Cecropis, Proteas; Hippothontis, -----enes, perhaps Metagenes; Archestratos and Dracontides of tribes not known. To this list we can add the names of Callias and Phormio. Phormio's tribe was probably Pandionis. That of Callias is unknown. Kirchner, *Prosopographia Attica*, assigns Dracontides to the tribe Antiochis.² Lacedaimonios, Proteas, Diotimos, Glaucon, Metagenes (?), and Dracontides were in command of the two expeditions to Coreyra in the autumn of 433.³ After the battle of Sybota they returned to Athens. In March Archestratos with one or more colleagues was sent to Macedon.⁴ About a month later Callias with four colleagues brought reinforcements to Archestratos.⁵ After the battle of Potidaea another expedition under Phormio was sent out. Callias had fallen in battle.⁶ Thus we have eight or nine generals engaged in Macedon and at Potidaea. Pericles remained at Athens.

The list of generals for the year 432-31 is not complete. Corrected it is as follows: Aegeis, Socrates;⁷ Pandionis, Phormio; Acamantis, Pericles and Carcinos; Cecropis, Proteas; and Eucrates of a tribe unknown. Thus Pericles, Phormio, and Proteas were re-elected, and Carcinos followed Glaucon in office.

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE
SWARTHMORE, PA.

¹ *Att. Pol.*, 290.

² No. 4551.

³ *IG*, I, 179; cf. Thuc. i. 45, 51. In Thucydides Andocides is named in place of Dracontides, evidently by mistake.

⁴ Thuc. i. 57. The MSS-reading is *μετ' ἀλλων δέκα*. This is of course impossible. The number cannot be greater than two.

⁵ *Ibid.* 61.

⁶ *Ibid.* 63 f.

⁷ Kirchner, *Prosop. Att.*, No. 13099.